IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No. 4:13-CR-00211-DGK
DALE D. MITCHELL, JR.)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR SUBSTITUTE ATTORNEY

On August 4, 2021, the Court revoked Defendant's supervised release due to his failure to abide by conditions requiring he refrain from use of a controlled substance and sentenced him to a nine-month term of imprisonment. ECF No. 99. Defendant intends to appeal and requests the Court appoint him a different attorney. ECF No. 100.

"It is well established that a defendant does not have the absolute right to the counsel of his choice." *United States v. Mentzos*, 462 F.3d 830, 839 (8th Cir. 2006). As the Eighth Circuit has explained:

To warrant substitute counsel, a defendant must show justifiable dissatisfaction with appointed counsel [such as] a conflict of interest, an irreconcilable conflict, or a complete breakdown in communication between the attorney and the defendant. The defendant's right to counsel, however, does not involve the right to a meaningful relationship between an accused and his counsel.

Hunter v. Delo, 62 F.3d 271, 274 (8th Cir. 1995) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Defendant does not state any reason why the Court should substitute his current counsel. Defendant's motion is therefore DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: August 18, 2021	/s/ Greg Kays
	GREG KAYS IUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT